

NOTES ON THE RIDE AND LEMCHE COMMENTS ON MY PROPOSAL ON
NOMINA DUBIA. Z.N.(S.) 1715
 (see volume 22, pages 265-266; 23, pages 11-12)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Entomology Research Division, Agr. Res. Serv.,
 U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.*)

Commissioners Ride and Lemche may be right in a certain sense that a formal Declaration is unwarranted or undesirable. However, it may be argued also that the situation is indeed one "not properly or completely covered by the Code" (78a), and that what is needed is an amendment (hence a Declaration or provisional amendment) as an addition to the guiding principles regarding the exercise of the plenary powers (79a). Such an amendment would in reality be no more than giving effect to a decision of the London Congress. I had originally considered that the first step should be a decision in principle, followed (if the vote were favourable) by working out of appropriate wording in English and French. However, it may be useful at this stage in the discussion to have a possible wording before us. I suggest the following for consideration as paragraph (iv) of Article 79a:

"(iv) a name that is a *nomen dubium* is not to be suppressed for that reason alone; if its identity is ever discovered, the name may then be suppressed if its application can be shown to constitute a serious disturbance to stability or universality."

It seems to me that if the Commission agrees in principle, it must do more than "silently agree" (Lemche). To remain silent will encourage zoologists to continue to prepare applications for suppression of *nomina dubia*. Even if the Secretary dares to return them (and I doubt that he would feel able to do so on the ground—scarcely quotable to correspondents as a defense or justification—of silent agreement among the Commissioners), he has added his waste time and postage to the applicant's original wastage.

Some positive, quotable decision is needed. I would not object to a definite statement of policy outside of a Declaration, so long as it is printed in the Bulletin as a notice to zoologists and as a basis that the Secretary can cite for return of an application. However, a formal amendment will be a more effective and forceful means of disposing of the problem, and in the future it will undoubtedly be more readily available to more people in future editions of the Code than in a volume of the Bulletin.

The case of *Xyleborus* cited by Dr. Lemche is not relevant to the present one. *Nomina dubia* are suppressed as such for the purpose of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy. *Xyleborus* Bowdich is a senior primary homonym. If the importance of the junior primary homonym merits its conservation, the senior must be disposed of by plenary action on the basis of the homonymy, not because it is a *nomen dubium*.

COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION ON *TRYCHOSIS* FOERSTER
 (Z.N.(S.) 1712)
 (see volume 22, pages 259-260)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Entomology Research Division, U.S. Department of
 Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Van Rossem's application makes no mention of the vital role of *Cryptus ambiguus* Tschek in this case, and it seems important to bring this to the attention of the Commissioners.

Schmiedeknecht (1904, *Opuscula ichneumonologica*, 2, Fasc. 7 : 487) placed *C. ambiguus* Tschek, 1870, in the synonymy of what he called "*titillator* Grav. [enhorst]." Perkins (1962), in an important study of the type-species of Foerster's genera, recognized that *titillator* was misidentified by Schmiedeknecht (i.e., it was not the true *titillator* Linnaeus) and adopted *ambiguus* Tschek as the valid name for *titillator* auctt.